

D. REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-25 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 23, 24, and 25 are independent claims. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-25 have been amended.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the acceptance of Applicants' formal drawings by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Objections To The Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification. In response, Applicants have added serial number and filing date information regarding co-pending applications to the specification, as requested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the specification has been overcome and respectfully request that the Examiner remove the objection to the specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner states that the specification fails to provide a detailed description of the "display panel identifier" and the "receiving a display panel identifier;" the "data control object" and the "creating one or more data control objects using the data definitions;" the "data panel," the "writing the qualifier values and data control objects to a data panel," the "creating a menu tab within a data panel," the "retrieving one more text labels," and the "writing

the text labels in the display panel." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Although Applicants disagree with the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, in the interest of moving the Application forward, Applicants have amended the claims as necessary in order to use terms that are more consistent with those used in Applicants' specification, as discussed in detail below:

1. "display panel identifier" and "receiving a display panel identifier"

The claims have been amended to use the terms "element request" and "receiving an element request from a user" in place of "display panel identifier" and "receiving a display panel identifier." These amendments are consistent with and supported by Figure 15, reference numerals 1504 and 1505, which show an element request being received from a user (i.e. caller 1502). Also see Figure 7, reference numeral 715, which shows receiving a user selection, which may be an element request. Also see Figure 9, reference numeral 900, which shows receiving a user request at a console.

The claims have further been amended to claim "locating a display name corresponding to the element request in a management definition object." This is consistent with and supported by Figure 15, where a display name is returned in reference numeral 1585. See Applicants' specification at page 38, line 15 through page 40, line 20 for a full and detailed discussion of how an appropriate display name is retrieved based upon an element request.

2. "data control object" and "creating one or more data control objects using the data definitions"

The claims have been amended to use the terms "data element" and "creating one or more data elements using the data definitions." These amendments are consistent with and supported by Figure 9. In Figure 9, data element names are shown by reference numeral 980. The data elements themselves include text boxes 950 and list boxes 960, in which the values of data elements may be stored. Further information regarding "data elements" and "creating one or more data elements using the data definitions" can be found in Applicants' specification on page 27, line 5, through page 29, line 5. In particular, please note page 28, lines 7-10, which describe the display of data element names 980 and their associated data element values (which are displayed in data element text boxes 950 and data element list boxes 960), based on information retrieved from the management information system.

Also note that exemplary claim 3, and similarly claims 10 and 17, have been amended to claim data elements being associated with an external data source. This is shown by reference numeral 970 in Figure 9. In addition, exemplary claim 5, and similarly claims 12 and 19, have been amended to claim data elements being selected from the group consisting of a text box control, a list box control, a combo box control, a check box control, and a radio button control. Again, this is consistent with Figure 9, which shows the examples of text boxes 950 and list boxes 960 as exemplary data elements. Further, exemplary claim 7, and similarly claims 14 and 21, have been amended to claim data specifications corresponding to data elements. This is also consistent with Figure 9, which shows "[s]pecifications for min, max, data types, and valid values

provided in CIM definition" associated with data element text boxes 950, and "[s]pecifications for list list box values provided in CIM definition" associated with data element list boxes 960.

3. "data panel" and "writing the qualifier values and data control objects to a data panel"

The claims have been amended to use the terms "display panel" and "writing the qualifier values and data elements to a display panel." This is consistent with and supported by Figure 9 and Applicants' specification, page 27, line 5 through page 29, line 5, which discusses display panel 930 in detail. As discussed in Applicants' specification on page 27, lines 24-25, "qualifier names from the management definition object are used to create tab values displayed on menu tabs 940." Also, note that data element names 980 and their associated data element values (which are stored in data element text boxes 950 and data element list boxes 960) are also displayed on display panel 930, as shown in Figure 9.

4. "creating a menu tab within a data panel"

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to use the term "display panel," rather than "data panel," and now claim "creating a menu tab within a display panel." As shown in Figure 9, menu tabs 940 are displayed on display panel 930. As discussed in Applicants' specification on page 27, lines 22-24, "[d]isplay 930 shows a number of menu tabs 940 used as containers in order to group management data. Qualifer names from the management definition object are used to create tab values displayed on menu tabs 940."

5. "retrieving one more text labels" and "writing the text labels in the display panel."

As shown in Figure 9, text labels, such as data element names 980, are displayed on display panel 930. As discussed in Applicants' specification on page 28, lines 4-21, data element names 980 are text labels that are retrieved from translated strings within NLS data files. These text labels, i.e. the translated strings, are then displayed on display panel 930, as shown in Figure 9.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0095142 to Patrizio et al. (hereinafter Patrizio). Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrizio. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

1. Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 removing Patrizio as a prior art reference

Applicants respectfully assert that Applicants completed and reduced to practice Applicants' claimed invention before the filing date of Patrizio. A declaration, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, has been duly executed by Applicant Kevin Barker and is included with this Response. Mr. Barker declares that Applicants' claimed invention was completed and reduced to practice prior to October 30, 2001. Exhibit "A" to Mr. Barker's declaration are IBM Invention Disclosure Forms that disclosed Applicants' claimed invention. These Disclosures were submitted to the IBM Intellectual Property Law Department in Raleigh, North Carolina prior to October 30, 2001. Note that each

PATENT

Disclosure Form contains a statement that a "proof of concept product" had been developed and, at the time of disclosure, was being evaluated to determine whether it should become a Tivoli product or an internal IBM product. Mr. Barker's declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, therefore, removes the Patrizio publication from consideration as prior art. Because, for the aforesaid reasons, the Patrizio publication is not prior art with respect to Applicants' claimed invention, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-25 are therefore allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Leslie A. Van Leeuwen
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742